



FW

7<sup>th</sup> November, 2006.  
To: Michael Woodward  
From: Denis Solomon

**Regarding: Patent application number 10/076, 266**

Dear Sir,

I am having great difficulty dealing with your office. This application prepared by a USA patent attorney was deemed needing a re-write. No specific details were supplied by your office as to why a rewrite was needed. Then again, I was accused of adding 'new material' to my personal rewrite submitted in 2006 (Ms. Ghali's letter 10/20/2006). I totally dispute this allegation. No specific lines, sentences or paragraphs were ever drawn to my attention. I wrote a letter requesting the pertinent material. No reply. Hence, the application was rejected. It seems dicta are handed down without grounds for appeal, and one cannot appeal since specific facts are not supplied by your office. I can make an argument in scientific terms why I disagree with your office's ruling, if I were ever granted this opportunity, but admittedly cannot do so with regards to a procedural format.

**Regarding: Patent application number 11/373, 515; filed 03/07/2006.**

My understanding from the formal application form is that if one had filed a previous declaration for a previous patent application (e.g. 10/076,266 filed in 2002) no new personal declaration was required. If I am wrong, please correct me. A letter mailed from your office (confirmation no. 8067, dated 10/30/2006) said I have filed no personal declaration, hence my packet was incomplete. I would be most grateful for a reply. I thank you for your attention to these matters.

Yours respectfully,

*Denis E. Solomon*

Denis Eon Solomon PhD.